

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/955,259	09/12/2001	Nestor Annibali	52071.00004	1187
759	90 01/09/2006		EXAM	INER
Cameron Kerrigan			JOIKE, MICHELE K	
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. One Maritime Plaza			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 300			1636	
San Francisco, CA 94111-3492			DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/955,259	ANNIBALI, NESTOR	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michele K. Joike, Ph.D.	1636	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE!	I.  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status	•		
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 O     2a) ⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b) □ This     3) □ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 4 and 24 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ⊠ Claim(s) 4 is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 24 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Burear * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. Is have been received in Application In the second in Application in the second in the seco	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/29/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Receipt is acknowledged of a reply to the previous Office Action, filed October 21, 2005. Amendments were made to claims 4 and 24. Claims 1-3 and 5-23 have been canceled.

Claims 4 and 24 are pending and under consideration in the instant application.

Any rejection of record in the previous Office Action, mailed July 22, 2005, that is not addressed in this action has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments concerning the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 24 have been considered. However, since that rejection has been withdrawn, the arguments are deemed moot.

Because this Office Action only maintains rejections set forth in the previous

Office Action and/or sets forth new rejections that are necessitated by amendment, this

Office Action is made FINAL.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/955,259

Art Unit: 1636

Enablement is considered in view of the Wands factors (MPEP 2164.01(A)).

These include: nature of the invention, breadth of the claims, guidance of the specification, the existence of working examples, state of the art, predictability of the art and the amount of experimentation necessary. All of the Wands factors have been considered with regard to the instant claims, with the most relevant factors discussed below.

Nature of the invention: The nature of the invention is a method of obtaining the deposited yeast strain, ATCC PTA-2260, of claim 4. The method entails transforming any yeast cell with any vector comprising the specific elements listed, selecting Mut<sup>S</sup> yeast cells, isolating the strain of claim 4 and re-transforming it.

Breadth of the claims: The method of making the deposited strain of claim 4 is broad because any yeast cell can be used, and any vector, or DNA construction, can be used to make the strain, therefore a multitude of combinations exist.

Guidance of the specification: On pages 30-31 of the Specification, applicant states that any vector can be used. It could have a variety of selectable markers, and be linear or circular. Some of the working examples use specific vectors, but it varies from example to example, i.e. pPIC9 or pPICZ $\alpha$ A. Since the claim language itself is a "DNA construct", any vector could be used in this method.

Additionally, "a yeast cell" is transformed with the DNA construct. No specific yeast strain is mentioned in the claim. While the Specification states that *Pichia pastoris* GS115 (ATCC No. 20864) is the preferred strain to use, it also states that any methylotrophic yeast could be used, citing *Torulopsis*, *Hansenula* and *Candida*, as

Art Unit: 1636

examples. Also, GS115 is a strain that was obtained from Invitrogen. Because GS115 is obtained from Invitrogen, the strain may not be the exact same genotype as the strain deposited with ATCC.

Predictability and state of the art: Cloning with Pichia pastoris is well known in the art. However, since any vector and any yeast cell can be used, there are a vast number of vectors and strains available for use in this method. There are even several Pichia vectors that are available with the AOX1 promoter (Invitrogen). pPIC9 and pPICZαA are two of them. There are strains that are available for selecting expression vectors containing HIS4 to generate the Mut<sup>S</sup> phenotype or for selecting zeocine resistant expression vectors with the Mut<sup>S</sup> phenotype (Invitrogen). Since any of these vectors or strains can be used, according to the Specification, it is highly unpredictable that the deposited strain ATCC PTA-2260 will be made.

In fact, with this method, applicant obtained clones that were *HIS*<sup>+</sup> and Mut<sup>S</sup>, which were not ATCC PTA-2260. ATCC PTA-2260 was just the "best yielding clone" (Applicant's remarks 10/21/05). V8, 10.1 was a clone with the same phenotype of ATCC PTA-2260, with the difference being that it had 8 copies of the second DNA construct instead of 13 that ATCC PTA-2260 has. Therefore, any one of the clones that applicant made with this method could be produced when practicing this method, along with other clones not encountered by Applicant.

Amount of experimentation necessary: Since the steps listed in the method could produce a yeast strain that is not the exact same strain as deposited under accession number ATCC PTA-2260, undue experimentation would be required to

**Art Unit: 1636** 

determine the genotype. Each clone would have to be sequenced to determine, for example, if it had one copy of the first vector, and 13 copies of the second vector. Indeed, applicants have not described the yeast strain deposited under ATCC PTA-2260 sufficiently so that the skilled artisan would be able to determine, without undue experimentation, whether any of the yeast strains made by the claimed method is exactly the same yeast (identical in all biochemical and physiological parameters) cell as the cells deposited at the ATCC under PTA-2260.

In view of the breadth of the claims and the lack of guidance provided by the specification as well as the unpredictability of the art, the skilled artisan would have required an undue amount of experimentation to make *Pichia pastoris* strain deposited under ATCC PTA-2260. Therefore, claim 24 is not enabled.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 4 is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Application/Control Number: 09/955,259

Art Unit: 1636

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michele K. Joike, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-5915. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Irem Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michele K Joike, Ph.D. Examiner

Art Unit 1636

RIMARY EXAMINER

A Trans